

### **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Office Action of June 12, 2009, which was made final and in which the Examiner rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, rejected claims 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and allowed claims 1-7, 9-18 and 28.

In response, claims 35-36 have been canceled, without prejudice. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

#### **Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 35 has been canceled, without prejudice.

#### **Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Svensson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,098,397) and, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Klein et al. (U.S. Patent 4,488,877). Claims 35-36 have been canceled, without prejudice.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The allowance of claims 1-7, 9-18 and 28 is acknowledged and appreciated.

#### **Conclusion**

After the cancellation of claims 35-36 by this paper, only allowed claims 1-7, 9-18, and 28 remain pending, and a notice of allowance is expected in due course.

No additional fees should be due in connection with this paper, but the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension fees or other relief which may be required, or credit any overpayment and notify us of same, to Deposit Account No. 04-1420.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Customer Number 74307

Date:

June 30, 2009

By:

David E. Bruhn

David E. Bruhn, Reg. No. 36,762  
(612) 340-6317